



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,617	12/07/2000	Gregory Weber	CISCO-3168	4191
7590 01/13/2005				
Marc S. Hanish Thelen Reid & Priest LLP P.O. Box 640640 San Jose, CA 95164-0640			EXAMINER SHERKAT, AREZOO	
			ART UNIT 2131	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/733,617

Applicant(s)

WEBER ET AL.

Examiner

Arezoo Sherkat

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 December 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This office action is responsive to Applicant's amendment received on August 4, 2004. Claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 have been amended. The text of claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 is unchanged, but their meaning is changed because they depend from amended claims.

New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because the last sheet of drawing, Fig. 4 is hand-drawn and hand-written numbering and labeling through out the drawings. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Applicant's arguments filed on August 4, 2004 have been fully considered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2131

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-12, 13-14, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borella et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,433 and Borella hereinafter), in view of Theimer et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,555,376 and Theimer hereinafter).

Regarding claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, Borella discloses a method for authorizing a command from a user received at a network device (i.e., RAS server) separate and distinct from an Authentication, Authorization, and Accounting (AAA) server (Col. 6, lines 40-60) including:

establishing a RADIUS session with the user (Col. 6, lines 40-59 and Col. 8, lines 15-30);

receiving a user profile for the user at the network device from an Authentication, server (i.e., a user profile may include a class of service field to indicate which class of service the packets from the user may utilize)(Col. 6, lines 59-67 and Col. 7, lines 1-67 and Col. 8, lines 1-15);

storing the user profile in a memory accessible by the network device (i.e., storing the user profile)(Col. 9, lines 49-61);

receiving the command (i.e. request) from the user, determining whether the command is authorized based on the information in the user profile stored in the memory, and authorizing or rejecting the command based on the results of said

Art Unit: 2131

determining (i.e., authorizing the request based on user profile)(Col. 4, lines 45-67 and Col. 5-8, lines 1-67).

Borella does not expressly disclose a user profile containing the information including a command set described by regular expression.

However, Theimer discloses a user profile containing information regarding which commands the user is authorized to execute, the information including command set described by regular expressions (i.e., i.e., command sets are described by regular expressions and pattern matching is used to determine whether or not a given tuple has been defined in the user profile)(Col. 14, lines 17-67 and Col. 15, lines 1-67 and Col. 16, lines 1-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Borella with the teachings of Theimer because it would allow to include a user profile containing information regarding which commands the user is authorized to execute, the information including command set described by regular expressions with the motivation to provide for a pattern matching technique with considerable amount of flexibility (Theimer, Col. 16, lines 50-67 and Col. 17, 1-10).

Regarding claims 2, 8, and 14, Borella discloses wherein the network device is a Network Access Server (NAS) (i.e., Remote Access Server, RAS)(Col. 1, lines 18-30 and Col. 3, lines 15-67).

Regarding claims 4, 10, and 16, Borella discloses wherein said determining includes comparing said command to a command set contained in said user profile and said authorizing includes authorizing the command if it is contained in said command set (i.e., Once the RADIUS server 32 receives the request, it validates the sending client. A request from a client 22 for which the RADIUS server 32 does not have a shared secret should be silently discarded. If the client is valid, the RADIUS server 32 consults a database of user to find the user whose name matches the request. The user entry in the database contains a list of requirements that must be met to allow access for the user)(Col. 4, lines 45-67 and Col. 5-8, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 5, 11, and 17, Borella discloses wherein said command set is a list of previously authorized commands (i.e., If the client is valid, the RADIUS server 32 consults a database of user to find the user whose name matches the request. The user entry in the database contains a list of requirements that must be met to allow access for the user)(Col. 4, lines 45-67 and Col. 5-8, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 6, 12 and 18, Borella does not expressly disclose wherein said command set is described by regular expressions.

However, Theimer discloses wherein said command set is described by regular expressions (i.e., command sets are described by regular expressions and pattern matching is used to determine whether or not a given tuple has been defined in the user profile)(Col. 16, lines 50-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Borella with the teachings of Theimer because it would allow to include command sets that are described by regular expressions with the motivation to provide for a pattern matching technique with considerable amount of flexibility (Theimer, Col. 16, lines 50-67 and Col. 17, 1-10).

Claims 3, 9, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borella et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,433 and Borella hereinafter) and Theimer et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,555,376 and Theimer hereinafter), in view of Malkin et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,061,650 and Malkin hereinafter), in further view of Torres et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,635 and Torres hereinafter).

Teachings of Borella and Theimer have been discussed previously.

Regarding claims 3, 9, and 15, Borella or Theimer does not expressly disclose the process of terminating the RADIUS session.

However, Malkin discloses further including the process of terminating a RADIUS session (i.e., deregisters the tunnel if the PPP connection with the remote node terminates prior to the expiration of the tunnel)(Col. 5, lines 40-50).

The combined teaching of Borella, Theimer, and Malkin does not expressly disclose purging said user profile from said memory when said RADIUS session is terminated.

However, Torres discloses purging said user profile from said memory (Col. 3, lines 10-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the combined teachings of Borella and Theimer with the teachings of Malkin because it would allow including the process of terminating a RADIUS session with the motivation to deregister the tunnel if the PPP connection with the remote node terminates prior to the expiration of the tunnel (Malkin, Col. 5, lines 40-50) and modify the combined teachings of Borella, Theimer, and Malkin with the teachings of Torres because it would allow purging said user profile from said memory with the motivation to provide for a technique where a single, centralized file contains information about users and applications and the file can be readily, easily, and efficiently modified through a customization user interface to add, delete, and/or update user and application information or to tailor user compute environments (Torres, Col. 3, lines 1-6).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arezoo Sherkat whose telephone number is (571) 272-3796. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/733,617

Page 9

Art Unit: 2131

Arezoo Sherkat
Patent Examiner
Group 2131
Jan 10, 2005

E. J. Jone
EXAMINER
PATENT EXAMINER